



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,988	10/11/2001	Susann Marie Keohane	AUS920010884US1	8102

7590
02/02/2005
Mr. Volel Emile
P.O. Box 202170
Austin, TX 78720-2170

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, GRETA LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/974,988

Applicant(s)

KEOHANE ET AL.

Examiner

Greta L. Robinson

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present invention.
2. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valys US Patent 6,549,914 in view of Beyda et al. US Patent 6,505,237 B2.

Art Unit: 2167

Regarding claim 1, **Valys** teaches a method of predicting a file download time before said file is being downloaded, said file having a size and being downloaded from a first computer system to a second computer system [note: col. 1 line 66 through col. 2 line 6 "*statistically analyzing an overhead or delivery requirement as a function of relevant manufacturing criteria of computer readable files to be downloaded to a target computer during a software download*"; also note: col. 2 lines 54-61], said method comprising the steps of:

calculating the predicted download time using the size of the file and a historical download time between the first computer system and the second computer system [note: col. 3 lines 8-19 using "*historical factory download metrics and files ... to determine which files should be included*"; also note: col. 4 lines 15-55; col. 9 lines 38-42]; and

displaying the calculated time [note: col. 9 line 42 through col. 10 line 10].

Although **Valys** teaches the invention as cited above, he does not explicitly disclose that the download time is based on the size of the file. **Beyda et al.** teaches this feature.

Beyda et al. teaches a requirement that may be utilized for the downloading of a file is the size of the file [see: col. 2 lines 53-65; col. 6 lines 53-65; and col. 7 lines 16-25; also note figure 3]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined **Beyda et al.** with **Valys** because **Beyda** further shows how the filtering conditions for downloading a file may be modified based on user preference, the customized criteria enhances **Valys** downloading process.

Art Unit: 2167

5. Regarding claims 2 and 3, wherein said historical download time is an average time taken to download a plurality of files ... based on an analysis ... [note: Valys, col. 13 lines 28-40 "*analysis ... includes history of the downloaded files*"].

6. Regarding claims 4 and 5, wherein the predicted download time is calculated by the first computer ... the second computer [note: Beyda et al. attachment filter 42 col. 6 lines 53-65].

7. The limitations of claims 6-20 parallel that of method claims 1-5, therefore they are rejected under the same rationale.

8. Applicant's arguments filed May 24, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the response applicant argued Valys does not teach, show or suggest "*calculating a predicted download time using the size of the file and an average file download time between the first computer system and the second computer system*". In response, the examiner respectfully maintains the rejection. Valys teaches *historical factory download metrics* (i.e. historical download time or average file download) that utilizes a set of weighting functions to determine which files should be included in a statistical file preload image [col. 3 lines 8-12]. The method includes analyzing a bandwidth requirement of computer readable files to be downloaded. Valys is combined with Beyda et al. because Beyda et al. shows consideration for the *size of the file* in

predicting download [see: col. 2 lines 62-67; col. 6 lines 32-54; col. 5 lines 62-65] and that alternate criteria may be configured for auto-downloading of files. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined Beyda et al. with Valys because Beyda et al. teaches customization of criteria for auto downloading of files [col. 2 lines 46-52]. Note US Patent 6,532,495 cited on form PTO 892 submitted in the last correspondence teaches a software module that calculates download times based on received data [note: col. 8 lines 39-67].

Applicant's arguments and amendment overcomes the drawing objection cited under 37 CFR 1.83(a), the objection to the specification, and the rejection cited under 35 USC 112 first paragraph.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2167

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greta L. Robinson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4118. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



GRETAROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Greta Robinson
Primary Examiner
January 28, 2005